

the National Human Rights Committee for POWs and MIAs. In 1980, the Naval Reserve Association named him "Man of the Year," and presented him with the Distinguished Service Award. In 1981, the Congressional Medal of Honor Society presented him with its distinguished service award for his leadership on national defense issues. He was also honored by the American Security Council for his work in the same area. Congressman McDonald also consistently received the Watchdog of the Treasury Award from the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB).

Congressman McDonald had a strong interest in foreign affairs. He was one of six lawmakers selected to attend a three-day conference commemorating the 30th anniversary of the United States Mutual Defense Treaty with South Korea. However, he was the only Member of Congress aboard Korea Airlines Flight 007 when it apparently strayed into Soviet airspace and was shot down without provocation, by a Soviet fighter, on August 31, 1983.

Larry McDonald was survived by his wife, Kathy, and his five children, Larry, Lauren, Tryggvi Paul, Callie Grace, and Mary Elizabeth. He is remembered for his distinguished career in Congress and the many lives he touched not only in the Seventh Congressional District of Georgia, but across America and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman Larry McDonald's career clearly demonstrates why we should name this court house in his honor. I ask you and my colleagues to join me in renaming the federal court house building in Rome, GA, after the Honorable Lawrence Patton McDonald, deceased Member of Congress.

#### ON THE CONTRIBUTION OF SLAVES TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE CAPITOL

**HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 2000*

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that I believe to be critically important in highlighting a disturbing but important fact about the history of this magnificent building and symbol of freedom, the U.S. Capitol.

Every day that we are here in session, our debates and legislative activities underscore that this is a living building that embodies America's greatest principles of democracy and liberty. However, one significant historical fact about this building is often forgotten, and that fact is that much of the construction of this Capitol in the 18th and 19th centuries was done by slave labor.

As we all know, slavery was not eliminated across the United States until the ratification of the 13th amendment in 1865. Before that date, slave labor was both legal and common throughout the South including the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia.

Public records attest to the fact that African-American slave labor was used in the construction of the U.S. Capitol. We should remember as well that many slaves at that time were veterans who had fought bravely for independence during the American Revolutionary War.

It is time that we recognize the contributions of these slave laborers, and I am proud today to join with Congressman JOHN LEWIS of Georgia in introducing a resolution to establish a special Congressional Task Force which will recommend an appropriate memorial to the labors of these great Americans to be displayed prominently here in the Capitol.

This year we celebrate the 200th anniversary of the first session of Congress to be held here in this historic building. I think that's a long enough time to go without a public and visible acknowledgement of the incongruous but important historical fact of the significant contribution of slaves to the construction of the world's greatest symbol of freedom.

#### H.R. 4461, AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY 2001

SPEECH OF

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 2000*

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule to H.R. 4461, Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for FY 2001. Unfortunately, I must oppose the rule because the legislation severely undercuts major initiatives for the farming community.

The bill reported by committee cuts the funds requested by the President for curbing monopolistic pricing practices in the food industry. These practices are becoming a matter of considerable concern in the agricultural sector and are viewed by many farmers as a major factor in the continued depression of farm commodity prices.

Like my colleagues, I am concerned that we must restore economic health to American farms. To do that, we must curb the rapid expansion of monopolistic practices that plague many sectors of the food industry. A disproportionate amount of companies control cattle purchases, beef processes, and wholesale marketing. And in merely 5 years, we have seen the margin between the price paid by farmers and the wholesale price of beef jump by 24 percent. Don't we owe more to the American farmer?

The administration requested \$7.1 million for the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Grain, Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) to investigate market concentration in agriculture and bring legal actions to stop anti-competitive behavior and other abusive practices. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership on the House Appropriations provided less than 20 percent of the requested funds. Such action casts considerable doubt on the administration's initiative to curb antitrust violations by some companies. We can do better, Mr. Speaker.

Some of my colleagues have already emphasized that the U.S. Department of Justice cannot bring antitrust action against these corporations giants because federal law reserves that responsibility for the Department of Agriculture. At the same time, no one has ever given the Agriculture Department adequate resources to meet its antitrust responsibilities.

In addition, the bill rejects the administration's request for FDA's tobacco program. Unfortunately, some still oppose the FDA's valid

jurisdiction to include the regulation of tobacco. This is regrettable and ill-advised at this time. At times, there are those who seek to entangle controversial issues that should not be contained in an appropriations measure. This is one of those times.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

#### VETERANS' HEALTH CARE

SPEECH OF

**HON. ROBIN HAYES**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2000*

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. This amendment jeopardizes the appropriations authority granted to Congress by the Constitution and will set a precedent that the administration and the President will determine spending instead of the U.S. Congress. I ask my colleagues to consider the precedent that this amendment will set with respect to our authority in Congress to determine spending levels for our country. This amendment is not about tobacco companies, it's about protecting funds for veterans' health care and whether or not you believe in the rule of law. Don't take \$20 million from veterans' health care or any other agency to pay for a lawsuit that history and legal precedent say you will not win. That would be a tremendous disservice to our veterans and our taxpayers. In today's Washington Times, Professor Michael Krauss argued the very same thing. "In 1997, Miss Reno herself testified before the Senate that the Federal Government had no legal basis to recover health care expenditures from tobacco companies." The Master Settlement Agreement between the states and the companies was supposed to remedy this situation. Mr. Krauss continues, the "White House had failed to enact its desired 55-cent-per-pack federal cigarette, Miss Reno shamelessly filed the very same lawsuit she had explicitly admitted was groundless."

As Mr. Krauss continues to argue, "the tobacco manufacturers never duped the Federal Government. Washington has known for decades that smoking is dangerous. Since 1964, every pack of cigarettes sold in the United States has carried a federally mandated warning of the health risks of smoking. So Washington has no direct fraud suit against Big Tobacco." In 1997 the Department of Veterans Affairs rejected former soldiers' allegations that they were sickened by cigarettes which were given to them by the government at no cost until 1974; a full ten years after Washington required health warnings. Krauss asserts that the Federal Government cannot assume the rights of individual smokers to sue for damages.

In 1947, the United States Supreme Court, in U.S. v. Standard Oil, concluded that the Federal Government may not, unless it has expressed statutory to do so, sue third parties to recover health care costs. Following the ruling, Congress passed the Medical Care Recovery Act (MCRA), which allows the Government to recover the medical treatment costs given to individual military and federal employees injured by a third party's negligence. MARA, however, does not allow the recovery